



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/780,466	02/17/2004	Kyle Marvin	BEAS-01354US0	1399
23910	7590	08/18/2008	EXAMINER	
FLIESLER MEYER LLP			DENG, ANNA CHEN	
650 CALIFORNIA STREET				
14TH FLOOR			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94108			2191	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/18/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/780,466	MARVIN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	ANNA DENG	2191	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 June 2008.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-41 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-41 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 2/17/2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 6/6/2008 has been entered.
2. The rejection under 35 U.S.C. 101 to claims 14-37, and 39-40 is withdrawn in view of applicants' amendment.
3. The rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph to claims 1-40 is withdrawn in view of applicants' amendment.
4. The rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph to claims 1-40 is withdrawn in view of applicants' amendment.
5. Claims 1-41 are pending.

Response to Amendment

Specification

6. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: it does not contain Summary of the Invention. See MPEP § 608.01(d). A brief summary or general statement of the invention as set forth in 37 CFR 1.73. The summary is separate and distinct from the abstract and is directed toward the invention rather than the disclosure

as a whole. The summary may point out the advantages of the invention or how it solves problems previously existent in the prior art (and preferably indicated in the Background of the Invention). In chemical cases it should point out in general terms the utility of the invention. If possible, the nature and gist of the invention or the inventive concept should be set forth. Objects of the invention should be treated briefly and only to the extent that they contribute to an understanding of the invention.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1-41 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abrari et al. USPUB 2006/0129978 A1 (hereinafter Abrari), in view of Ballard et al. USPN 7,111,243 B1 (hereinafter Ballard).

Per Claim 1 (Currently Amended):

Abrari teaches **A method for providing a reusable software control** (Abrari, [0009], "the invention that reconciles component and business rules technologies, combining the reusability features of component technologies with business rules technologies"), **comprising:**

incorporating the control into an Integrated Development Environment (IDE), wherein a graphical representation of the control can be interactively manipulated (Abrari, [0024], FIGS. 6-18, shows examples of user interface windows and elements displayed by implementations of the IDE, also [0030], “The IDE includes a vocabulary 181, which represents the business entities, their attributes, and their associations (relationships) in form of a tree view...generated from business objects, from a relational database, or from an XML schema”; [0039], “A rule component 142 is preloaded with the rules in a rulepack for optimal performance .The rule components 142 can interact with various types of business components ...using standardize messaging (e.g., XML messaging). The business intelligence server 140 provides a central integration hub interact with diverse application components 132 (reusable components), such as Microsoft COM components...EJB components and Java components. The business intelligence server 140 can turn any Java application server into an application integrator, acting as a control center for an enterprise information system, emphasis added), and

wherein the graphical representation of the control includes a graphical representation of a programmatic interface for the control (Abrari, [0027], “The front end of the development platform 160 is provided by ...used for rapid development of graphical user interfaces (GUIs), [0029], Business rules, which often make up the bulk of business logic, are built and maintained in the visually declarative environment of a rules IDE 180. This allows...to create and maintain enterprise business rules as reusable, adaptable components, which will be referred to as rulepacks (XML

documents, see [0030])). Rulepacks are declarative components that encapsulate a set of business rules automation the knowledge of a particular context of the business process"); [0053], "FIG. 7 shows in pane 704 a partially expanded vocabulary tree ...such as entity Account (node 706), are entities. The Account entity has been expanded (access) by a user to show the attributes, such as the attribute number (node 708), of the Account entity. When an entity is expanded, its relationships with other entities, if any, are also shown");

wherein when a control is added to the IDE, the IDE adds an annotation to a control file so that the IDE can identify the control file as being associated with the control (Abrari, [0075], Expressions defined using this ruleshee can be used as derived business terms on other rulesheets. The expressions defined (control) are automatically added to the vocabulary (IDE) as an attribute of the anchor entity (annotation) of the rulesheet (control file). The rules that define an expression are thus reused in and simplify higher level rulesheets. This allows rulesheets to be logically combined for building more complex rulesheets... This is fundamentally how rulesheets are logically linked to each other; also, see vocabulary is included in IDE; also, see [0030], The IDE includes a vocabulary 181, which represents the business entities, their attributes, and their associations (relationships) in the form of a tree view. The vocabulary can be created within the IDE).

Abrari does not explicitly teach **exposing services associated with the control and related to programmatically interacting with a portal; and wherein the control has a customizable interface.**

However, Ballard teaches **exposing services associated with the control and related to programmatically interacting with a portal** (Ballard, Col. 14, lines 60-67, col. 21, lines 53-55, server utilities, portal processor 365 that is used to handle the processing of data requests and instructions passed to and from user application interface 255); **and wherein the control has a customizable interface** (Ballard, col. 22, lines 41-43, “A customized application user interface 255 optionally includes a number of configurable user interface elements each further including a number of configurable properties”; as an example, see col. 27, lines 19-35).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the computer art at the time of the invention was made to modify the method disclosed by Abrari to include **exposing services associated with the control and related to programmatically interacting with a portal; and wherein the control has a customizable interface** using the teaching of Ballard. The modification would be obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to customize internet application and their associated user interfaces in a browser based environment as once suggested by Ballard (Ballard, col4, line 66-67 through col. 4, lines 1-4).

Per Claim 2:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and Ballard further teaches **a first group of services related to portal tracking** (Ballard, col. 14, lines 60-67, also, FIG. 7, col. 18, lines 17-36); **and a second group of services related to portal personalization** (Ballard, col. 18, lines 60-67, optional display properties per specified user; col. 19, lines

16-17, configuration is applied to only one user interface element on a specific user interface for a specific user; .col. 27, lines 4-11, customization of the interaction models used for communication between internet application system 250 and the client displaying application user interface 255.

Per Claim 3:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and Abrari further teaches **graphically connecting the control to other controls to establish flow-of-control at run-time** (Abrari, [0053], “FIG. 7 shows in pane 704 a partially expanded vocabulary tree ...such as entity Account (node 706), are entities. The Account entity has been expanded (access) by a user to show the attributes, such as the attribute number (node 708), of the Account entity. When an entity is expanded, its relationships with other entities, if any, are also shown”).

Per Claim 4:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and Abrari further teaches **the control includes annotated code** (Abrari, [0038], “communicate with the rule components 142 through a standardized messaging scheme...(e.g., direct Java calls) and ... (e.g., using XML-based messages); also, [0038], [0052], “actions may post a message of type violation, warning, or information”).

Per Claim 5:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and Abrari further teaches **the control can use other controls** (abrari, [0053], “FIG. 7 shows in pane 704 a partially expanded vocabulary tree ...such as entity Account (node 706), are entities. The Account entity has been expanded (access) by a user to show the attributes, such as the attribute number (node 708), of the Account entity. When an entity is expanded, its relationships with other entities, if any, are also shown”).

Per Claim 6:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and Abrari further teaches **specifying IDE characteristics of the control** (Abrari, [0029], “Business rules, which often make up the bulk of business logic, are built and maintained in the visually declarative environment of a rules IDE 180...to create and maintain enterprise business rules as reusable components, which will be referred to as rulepacks. Rulepacks are declarative components that encapsulate a set of business rules automating the knowledge of a particular context of the business process”).

Per Claim 7:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and Ballard further teaches **the services related to interacting with a portal can include one or more of: portal personalization, portal events and portal configuration** (Ballard, col. 27, lines 4-11, customization of the interaction model used for communication (portal personalization)).

Per Claim 37:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and Abrari further teaches **control includes software methods, wherein the graphical representation of the control includes graphical representations of the software methods** (Abrari, [0079], “The computer system can be programmed to provide a graphical user interface through which computer programs interact with users”).

Per Claims 8-13, and 38:

These are another method version of claimed method discussed above (claims 1-7, and 37, respectively), wherein all claimed limitations also have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, these claims are also obvious.

Per Claims 14-20, and 39:

These are computer-based system version of claimed method discussed above (claims 1-7, and 37, respectively), wherein all claimed limitations also have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, these claims are also obvious.

Per Claims 21-27, and 40:

These are another computer-based system version of claimed method discussed above (claims 1-7, and 37, respectively), wherein all claimed limitations also have been

addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, these claims are also obvious.

Per Claims 28-34, and 41:

These are machine readable medium version of claimed method discussed above (claims 1-7, and 37, respectively), wherein all claimed limitations also have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, these claims are also obvious.

Per Claims 35-36:

These are computer readable storage medium version of claimed method discussed above (claims 1, and 37, respectively), wherein all claimed limitations also have been addressed and/or covered in cited areas as set forth above. Thus, accordingly, these claims are also obvious.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed on 6/6/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants argued:

The independent claims have been amended to add the feature that "when a control is added to the IDE, the IDE adds an annotation to a control file so that the IDE

can identify the control file as being associated with the control". This feature is not shown or made obvious by the cited prior art.

Examiner response:

Abrari does teach when a control is added to the IDE, the IDE adds an annotation to a control file so that the IDE can identify the control file as being associated with the control (see Abrari, [0075], Expressions defined using this rulesheet can be used as derived business terms on other rulesheets. The expressions (control) defined are automatically added to the vocabulary (IDE) as an attribute of the anchor entity of the rulesheet (control file). The rules that define an expression are thus reused in and simplify higher level rulesheets. This allows rulesheets to be logically combined for building more complex rulesheets... This is fundamentally how rulesheets are logically linked to each other; also, [0030], The IDE includes a vocabulary 181, which represents the business entities, their attributes, and their associations (relationships) in the form of a tree view. The vocabulary can be created within the IDE). Here, when the expressions (controls) defined, are automatically added to the vocabulary (IDE) as an attribute or the anchor entity (annotation) of the rulesheet (control file). Thus, the combination of Abrari and Ballard teaches all the limitations in present application.

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier

communications from the examiner should be directed to Anna Deng whose telephone number is 571-272-5989. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 9:30 AM - 6:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wei Zhen can be reached at 571 -272-3708. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Anna Deng/

Examiner, Art Unit 2191

8/11/2008